

states and tribal governments that request help in implementing their respective visions of sustainability.

In addition to minimizing some of the harmful impacts that unplanned development can have on local and regional ecosystems, good planning and design makes smart business sense. Planning and design help to create communities with character—places where people want to be. As more people are attracted to such places—both residents and tourists—local economies flourish.

CCA has garnered bipartisan support, as well as the endorsement of a broad array of organizations, including planners, conservationists, preservationists, and the National Association of Realtors.

Thank you again for your sponsorship of “The Community Character Act” and your continued commitment to enhancing more livable communities across America. I look forward to working with you to enact this legislation.

Sincerely,

NANCY C. SOMERVILLE,  
*Executive Director.*

SMART GROWTH AMERICA,  
*Washington, DC, April 4, 2001.*

Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER

Hon. WAYNE GILCREST,

*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BLUMENAUER AND REPRESENTATIVE GILCREST: Smart Growth America would like to commend you on the introduction of the Community Character Act of 2001. We support both the bill and your efforts to assist states, multi-state regions and tribal governments in their efforts to revise their land use planning legislation and develop comprehensive plans.

Planning for future growth and directing development so that it strengthens existing communities while building upon their physical, cultural historical assets is integral to smart growth. We applaud your foresight and willingness to help states, tribal government and regions in their ongoing efforts to achieve smart growth by coordinating transportation, housing and education infrastructure investments while conserving historic, scenic and natural resources.

The Community Character Act makes the federal government a partner in the ongoing efforts of states, regions and tribal governments that want to plan for future growth. We applaud your efforts and look forward to working with you to pass this timely legislation.

Sincerely,

DON CHEN,  
*Director,*  
*Smart Growth America.*

# DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE ACCESS ACT TECHNICAL COR- RECTIONS ACT OF 2001

## HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, April 4, 2001*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the District of Columbia College Access Act Technical Corrections Act of 2001. I am particularly pleased and appreciate to be joined by my colleagues, D.C. Subcommittee Chair CONNIE MORELLA and former Chair TOM DAVIS, who are original cosponsors of this bill and were original cosponsors of the landmark College Access Act that has proved so successful.

This bill is necessary to correct three problems that have arisen in the administration of the District's Tuition Assistance Grant Program, authorized in 1999 with the passage of the District of Columbia College Access Act. The Act allows D.C. residents in-state tuition at public colleges and universities nationwide or a \$2500 stipend at private colleges and universities in the region.

First, the bill amends the College Access Act to remove a provision limiting the benefits of the Act to residents who graduated from high school before January 1, 1998. The bill would allow current college seniors and a smaller group of juniors who are presently excluded from the program, but are otherwise eligible for College Access Act benefits to receive those benefits. The arbitrary cutoff date, which was not included in the bill passed by the House, was put in the bill in the Senate out of concern that there might not be enough money to cover all eligible students. Fortunately, the evidence does not support this assumption, allowing the students eligible in the original House bill to be funded. The District has received over 3500 applications and placed over 1600 students at colleges and universities across the country. The program's \$17 million appropriation was originally derived with the assumption that current college juniors and seniors would indeed qualify, and the program currently has the funds to allow these students to participate. It is inherently unfair for D.C. residents who are college freshmen and sophomores to get the benefit, while students who are juniors and seniors do not.

Second, the bill removes the arbitrary three year deadline for college admission in order to be eligible for the benefits in the College Access Act. The bill as passed in the House never intended to deny in-state tuition to students who had to work after high school or who have decided to get a college degree later in life. The three year deadline language was also placed in the Act by the Senate to control the cost of the program. However, the District has done a study of the data and it is clear that it has the funds to include these students in the program. It is unfair to penalize otherwise eligible students because their life circumstances necessitated that they work before entering college. The Congress should applaud and encourage these students. The Department of Education, for example, does not place a similar constraint on its programs.

Third, the bill closes the loophole that currently allows foreign nationals who live in the District to receive the benefits of the Act. The congressional intent of the bill was to provide state university system-type higher education options to D.C. residents, not foreign nationals who happen to live in the District. Most of these students already have the option to take advantage of their own country's higher educational systems. The bill merely mirrors the Department of Education's own statutory requirements on this matter.

The positive impact of the College Access Act on the District of Columbia has been extraordinary. For the first time, D.C. students have the same higher educational choices available to them as residents of the fifty states. This bill seeks only to include those who were arbitrarily left out of the Act from receiving these benefits.

The end of the current school year is rapidly approaching and current college seniors will begin to graduate in May. Because of the ne-

cessity for swift passage and the non-controversial nature of this bill, I am asking Chairwoman MORELLA to seek to have the bill placed on the suspension calendar as soon as we return from recess.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important, noncontroversial measure.

## ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY COUNSELING IMPROVEMENT ACT

### HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 4, 2001*

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Elementary and Secondary Counseling Improvement Act, legislation to provide for elementary and secondary school counseling programs. The epidemic of school shootings across the nation exemplifies the urgent need for school-based mental health services for our youth. Many youth who may be headed toward school violence or other tragedies can be helped if we identify their early symptoms.

The lack of mental health interventions can produce devastating results for children, including disrupted social and educational development, academic failure, substance abuse problems, or juvenile justice system involvement. The bottom line is that we need to identify and treat mental illness in youth at its earliest stages.

In January, Dr. David Satcher, the Surgeon General, released a National Action Agenda for Children's Mental Health, in which it was found that the nation is facing a public crisis in mental health for children and adolescents. According to the report, while one in ten children and adolescents suffer from mental illness severe enough to cause some level of impairment, fewer than one in five of these children receive needed treatment. Dr. Satcher urged that “we must educate all persons who are involved in the care of children on how to identify early indicators for potential mental health problems.”

According to Dr. Satcher, “the burden of suffering by children with mental health needs and their families has created a health crisis in this country. Growing numbers of children are suffering needlessly because their emotional, behavioral, and developmental needs are not being met by the very institutions and systems that were created to take care of them.”

We must ensure that children with mental health needs are identified early and provided with the services they so desperately need to help them succeed in school and become healthy and contributing members of society.

Providing mental health services in schools is a wise long-term, cost-effective approach to reducing youth violence, developing a positive school environment, increasing student achievement and improving the overall well-being of our nation's youth. Schools provide a tremendous opportunity to identify potential mental health problems in children. Children spend a high percentage of their time in school, especially during their critical years of learning and development.

Teachers and other school professionals have the chance to identify potential problems and get children the help they need. Schools can provide underserved youth with or at-risk